

## CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF)

### Revised PAF indicators used for 2015 CERF country reviews

<b>Inputs: CERF Funding</b>			
<b>Input I: Funding Available to UN Agencies/IOM</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Level</b>
1	Funding available for crises (rapid response & underfunded window) by country. CERF as a percentage of other sources of funding available.	CERF secretariat	Global
<b>Input II: Transparent and Inclusive Prioritization and Decision Making</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Level</b>
2	Intra- and inter-cluster/sector prioritization process is inclusive of all relevant stakeholders, and adheres to Principles of Partnership (endorsed by the Global Humanitarian Platform, 12 July 2007).	RC/HC, cluster leads, recipient agencies	Country
3	Agencies involve their intended implementing partners in CERF project selection and formulation.	Cluster leads, recipient agencies	Country
4	Demonstrated involvement of affected community in needs assessment and programme design (required for underfunded emergencies and if unavailable for rapid onset, justification and plan for consultation in place).	RC/HC and Cluster Leads/Co-Cluster Leads, Recipient agencies	Country
5	Analysis of funding undertaken to inform prioritization process and facilitate appropriate direction of funds	RC/HC	Country
6	CERF underfunded (UFE) country selection/apportionment process at headquarters level undertaken in a transparent manner.	CERF secretariat	Global
7	Where applicable, the analysis, consultation and prioritization processes for CERF allocation take into consideration Country Based Pooled Funds.	RC/HC	Country
<b>Input III: Coherent Country Submission (including complementarity with other sources of funding)</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Level</b>
8	CERF submission to the HC is of high quality and consistent with humanitarian priorities.	Cluster Leads, Recipient agencies	Country
9	CERF request adheres to relevant quality standards and the CERF life-saving criteria.	RC/HC	Country
10	CERF request is considered timely and appropriate with respect to needs and context.	RC/HC	Country
11	CERF where applicable uses existing Country Based Pooled Fund processes and structures to support CERF allocations.	RC/HC	Country

12	RC/HC allocates CERF funds through a strategy that considers other sources of funding (including Country Based Pooled Funds where these exists) and uses these according to their comparative advantage.	RC/HC	Country
13	The IASC Principals' 2011 Commitments on AAP demonstrably incorporated into project submissions and reporting as per the guidelines (This includes that agency commitments on such cross-cutting issues as gender, protection, diversity and disability are identified and addressed in the proposed response).	RC/HC, cluster leads, recipient agencies	Country
<b>Input IV. Agency Capacity, M/R &amp; E + Quality Assurance Systems in Place</b>			
#	Indicator	Responsible	Level
14	Agency performance (capacity to implement within the timeframe of the grant, past performance, speed of distribution and absorptive capacity) is considered when developing and reviewing the proposal.	RC/HC, cluster leads, recipient agencies, implementing partners	Country
15	Agencies, both at HQ and in the field provide satisfactory (quality and timeliness) inputs (as defined by CERF secretariat guidelines) to the RC/HC CERF Report and the UN Agency/IOM HQ narrative report, which adhere to reporting guidelines	UN agencies/IOM CO and HQ	Country, Global
16	The RC/HC CERF report is prepared in an inclusive and transparent manner involving relevant stakeholders	UN agencies, cluster leads, implementing partners, OCHA CO/RO	Country
17	Agencies have the procurement/sub-contracting procedures suited for emergency situations and sufficient staff, access, etc.	UN agencies/ IOM CO and HQ	Country, Global
18	Agencies receiving grants have internal monitoring, evaluation, quality assurance and accountability mechanisms.	UN agencies/ IOM HQ	Country, Global
19	CERF secretariat has provided adequate global guidance on the standards for reporting and CERF-related processes.	CERF secretariat	Global
20	OCHA CO/RO, in support of the RC/HC, provides guidance to agencies, and facilitates input for RC/HC CERF report.	OCHA CO/RO	Country
<b>Input V: Streamlined Review, Allocation, Distribution and Overall Reporting</b>			
#	Indicator	Responsible	Level
21	Average number of working days between final submission of a CERF grant request package from RC/HC and fund disbursement by OPPBA to UN HQ	CERF secretariat, Office of the Controller, ERC	Global
22	Average number of working days from disbursement from UN HQ to country office	UN HQ	Country, Global
23	a) Timely sub-granting arrangements between CERF recipient agencies and their implementing partners. b) Number of days from UN agency/IOM HQ receives CERF funding to first installment disbursed to implementing	Recipient agencies with partners	Country (a), Global (a, b, c)

	partners (IPs). c) Number of days from UN agency/IOM HQ receives CERF funding to their implementing partners (IPs) start implementation of CERF funded activities.		
24	Overall quality and timeliness of the RC/HC CERF report	HC/RC, UN agencies	Country
<b>Outputs: Humanitarian Actors Better Able to Respond</b>			
<b>Output I: Time-Critical Life-Saving Activities Supported</b>			
#	Indicator	Source	Level
25	CERF funds allow agencies to demonstrate capability to leverage donor confidence for future contributions.	UN agency/IOM financial data and qualitative feedback from Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations.	Country, Global
26	Availability of CERF funding recognized by relevant stakeholders (recipient agencies, NGOs, INGOs, Government, other donors) as being fundamental to ability to respond to life saving needs and gaps.	Qualitative Feedback from RC/HC CERF reports, Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations	Country
27	Extent to which gaps, both geographic and sectoral, have been identified and addressed through use of CERF funds.	Country reviews, Project/cluster documents	
<b>Output II: Increased Coordination and HC Leadership</b>			
#	Indicator	Source	Level
28	CERF contributes to improve coordination and to enhance HC leadership.	Qualitative Feedback from RC/HC CERF reports and Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations	Country
29	Strengthened function of clusters and of inter-cluster forum.	Qualitative feedback from Stakeholders	Country
30	RC/HC leverages CERF and complementarity between different sources of funding is enhanced. (e.g. funds are used jointly and strategically according to their respective comparative advantages).	Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations, OCHA CO/RO	Country
31	The RC/HC CERF reporting process fosters joint reflection on results achieved with CERF funds and lessons learned	UN agencies, cluster leads, implementing partners, OCHA CO/RO	Country
<b>Output III: UN Agencies' Capacity Strengthened</b>			

#	Indicator	Source	Level
32	Extent to which CERF enhances the ability of recipient agencies to respond to humanitarian crises.	Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations HQ level bilateral partnership reporting and meetings	Country
<b>Output IV. Timely Response</b>			
#	Indicator	Source	Level
33	Number and cause of no-cost extension requests.	CERF Internal Tracking, Third Party Monitoring, After Action Reviews, Country Reviews	Country
34	CERF funds fill a critical time gap as measured in relation to time that other contributions are received.	UN Agency/IOM specific financial data, Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, RC/HC CERF reports	Country
35	Utilization rates of CERF funding.	CERF Financial Reports	Global
<b>Outcomes: Humanitarian Performance Strengthened</b>			
<b>Outcome I: Humanitarian Reform Process, incl. Transformative Agenda, Supported</b>			
#	Indicator	Source	Level
36	Extent to which CERF supports the full Humanitarian Programme Cycle and the collective results that the humanitarian community aims to achieve.	Indicators when available. Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations	Country
37	Extent to which CERF has acted as a tool to incentivize overall coordination, empowered RC/HC leadership and strengthened accountability, including accountability to affected populations.	Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, RC/HC CERF reports, After Action Reviews and Evaluations	Country
<b>Outcome II: Predictability and Reliability Enhanced</b>			
#	Indicator	Source	Level
38	Response capacity is strengthened given knowledge that	Qualitative Feedback	Country

	CERF is a reliable source of funding.	from UN agencies/IOM	
39	Operations deployed more rapidly due to 'predictability' of CERF as a quick funding source.	UN Agency/IOM reporting	Country
<b>Outcome III: Quality Response</b>			
#	Indicator	Source	Level
39	Extent of coverage of beneficiary targets in relation to the initial proposal (e.g. number, type).	Monitoring data when available, HC/RC CERF report template, Qualitative Feedback	Country
40	Agencies' CERF-related outcomes are reported to CERF and the RC/HC on the basis of their M/R & E and quality assurance systems	UN agencies/IOM reporting, third party monitoring, evaluations, Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews	Country
41	For the CERF, evaluative processes enable continuous improvement and ensure a quality response. Evaluations are undertaken regularly and there is a management response to recommendations.	Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations Website analytics	Global
44	Evaluations undertaken demonstrate CERF's contribution to a more coherent and effective quality response.	Qualitative Feedback from Country Reviews, After Action Reviews and Evaluations	Global